

ORIGINAL

NAS7.000105
NASA - JPL
SSIC No. 9661

REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS' MEETING

NASA/JET PROPULSION LABORATORY

TELECON

10 July 1996

ATTENDEES:

Jon Bishop, RWQCB-LA

Charles L. Buril, JPL

Mark Cutler, Foster Wheeler

Debbie Lowe, US EPA

Dan Melchior, Foster Wheeler

Penny Nakashima, DTSC

Stephen Niou, URS

Judith A. Novelly, JPL

B.G. Randolph, Foster Wheeler

L. R. Linn & Associates
Suite 111-10
345 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA. 90071
(213) 628-7874



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS' MEETING

NASA/JET PROPULSION LABORATORY

TELECON

10 July 1996

ATTENDEES:

Jon Bishop, RWQCB-LA
Charles L. Buril, JPL
Mark Cutler, Foster Wheeler
Debbie Lowe, US EPA
Dan Melchior, Foster Wheeler
Penny Nakashima, DTSC
Stephen Niou, URS
Judith A. Novelly, JPL
B.G. Randolph, Foster Wheeler

Reported by: Louise K. Mizota, CSR 2818

Pasadena, California

July 10, 1996

1:40 P.M.

BURIL: Let me just ask to have a roll call here. I'll call off the names.

Dan Melchior, are you there?

MELCHIOR: Yes.

BURIL: Mark and B.G.

RANDOLPH: Here.

CUTLER: Yes.

BURIL: Stephen.

NIOU: Yes.

BURIL: Debbie.

LOWE: Yes.

BURIL: Penny.

NAKASHIMA: Here.

BURIL: Jon.

BISHOP: Here.

BURIL: On this end are Judy and Chuck, and we also have our recorders here since we called this to be an RPM meeting.

Folks, because it is a telecon and with all the problems that we've had, I'd like to ask a

1 couple of things.

2 First, I'd like to be sure that when we
3 start speaking, that you identify yourself prior to
4 you beginning your statement. That's just for the
5 benefit of us knowing who you are and to be sure
6 that we got the record straight.

7 And if you could also let us know in some
8 way that you're done speaking so that we don't end
9 up tripping over each other as we go. With this
10 system I have a feeling that one person may start
11 talking and if another one tries to get in, neither
12 one will probably know the other one is speaking.
13 It's going to get kind of tangled otherwise. So if
14 we could try to observe those rules of formality, I
15 think it will work out pretty well.

16 I think you all have the agenda in front
17 of you. The first item up was the comments on the
18 addenda that we received from Penny.

19 And, Penny, I guess I'd like to just have
20 you, if you would, kind of go through where you're
21 coming from on each one of these comments because
22 it's something that, quite frankly, took us by
23 surprise in several areas, and we'd just like to
24 understand where you're coming from.

25 NAKASHIMA: Is this for everything on the list?

1 BURIL: Well, I tell you --

2 NAKASHIMA: Why don't you start with -- go down,
3 and the comments you have problems with and you want
4 to discuss.

5 BURIL: We can do that, too.

6 Let's start off with number 1 under the
7 Workplan.

8 A is no problem. We don't have a concern
9 with that.

10 B, I think that there's probably a
11 situation there where we are going to have to make a
12 determination about upgradient and downgradient over
13 the course of time. We don't have a good
14 understanding of which way the water flows and it's
15 part of the reason for having this quarterly thing.

16 I think as time goes on we'll be able to
17 discern better what it is that we're doing and make
18 decisions about how frequently or not frequently to
19 sample wells as time progresses.

20 I think that's about the best answer we
21 can give you on that one.

22 NAKASHIMA: So are you saying you're not at this
23 point in time or for the year of quarterly
24 monitoring, that you will not monitor just the
25 upgradient wells? You'll monitor all of them for a

1 year and then you'll look at the data. But how are
2 you going to decide, though, when you have the
3 groundwater reversals, the direction of groundwater
4 flow reversal, which one is -- depending on the time
5 of year, your upgradient is going to be different.

6 BURIL: Okay. That is something that we will
7 probably have to try to discern over time, since we
8 do not know the conditions under which the reversal
9 occurs concretely. We have identified it under
10 certain conditions, but we do not know how to
11 anticipate those conditions at this point with a
12 certainty that allows us to know.

13 NAKASHIMA: So maybe that approach, though, is
14 not --

15 BURIL: Penny, I'm going to have to ask you to
16 please wait until we finish because it is hard for
17 us to hear you. So go ahead now, please.

18 NAKASHIMA: So what I'm saying is maybe this
19 approach that you're taking is not appropriate for
20 the conditions here at JPL since you do have
21 reversals in the direction of groundwater flow.

22 BURIL: What approach are you indicating? I'm
23 not sure I understand.

24 NAKASHIMA: Let me find the page. You state in
25 the upgradient background wells that the screens

1 will be sampled annually to monitor background water
2 quality. And since the reversal in the direction of
3 groundwater flow occurs at this site, this approach
4 of doing it annually for upgradient is not a good
5 approach.

6 CUTLER: Can I add something? This is Mark.

7 The way this is set up, it's a little
8 generic. It's pretty much out of guidance, but in
9 practical use at JPL, the upgradient wells near the
10 mound, or the mouth of the Arroyo, Wells 1 and 15
11 and 9, we've been monitoring water levels out there
12 for many years. Those are always upgradient.
13 There's never reversals right there. The mound is a
14 very consistent, almost permanent feature.

15 NAKASHIMA: Right. But what about on the west
16 side of the site?

17 CUTLER: On the other side, we haven't noticed
18 any changes, really, in any levels of contaminants
19 over there with reversals. These reversals seem to
20 be relatively short lived and don't really move
21 things around that much. It may be we monitor for a
22 year, write a report, make recommendations and if
23 people don't agree with it, we can change it. But
24 we don't see contaminants in Well 7 all of a sudden
25 showing up in Well 6 because of a four- or six-week

1 reversal.

2 It really doesn't change major contaminant
3 movement. It mixes it up a little bit, but it
4 doesn't really turn it 180 degrees.

5 So if we look at some of this long-term
6 data we don't really see some of the things you
7 might be concerned about.

8 We would probably, in all honesty, want to
9 monitor some of those upgradient wells at that part
10 of the site anyway, because there are contaminants
11 coming from off site.

12 BURIL: This is Chuck.

13 Penny, I think I understand your concern.
14 I'm not sure that in the forum that we're in right
15 now we're going to be able to discuss it adequately.
16 Let's, if we could, table this one for the time
17 being. We'll use what I learned in my TQA training
18 as a parking lot issue and set that aside for the
19 time being, and let's move on and see whether some
20 of the other ones maybe are a little more easily
21 resolved.

22 LOWE: This is Debbie.

23 I wanted to suggest that this is not an
24 issue that we need to resolve right now since JPL
25 will be monitoring all wells and all screens in all

1 wells quarterly for the first year. JPL or NASA, in
2 their response to this comment, could acknowledge
3 that DTSC has a concern about this, that JPL doesn't
4 fit into the traditional sense of upgradient and
5 downgradient because there are reversals and flows
6 that may affect contaminant concentrations, and that
7 JPL will keep this in mind in producing the first
8 report, I can't remember what it's called, that
9 proposes decreasing sampling frequency for wells.

10 BURIL: This is Chuck again.

11 I think that sounds fine.

12 Mark, if I recall correctly, that is how
13 we had stated the initial year of sampling, is it
14 not?

15 CUTLER: Right. That's basically our intent as
16 well, Debbie, is really to wait and see after this
17 first year and then all get together and see what
18 makes sense.

19 BURIL: Why don't we table that one for the time
20 being. I think that perhaps that may answer Penny's
21 question, but I'm not sure that it will. So if we
22 could just move forward and see what else we might
23 have that we want to bring back and take a look at.

24 On number 2 under the workplan, the
25 Sampling Frequency, we've got that on page 8

1 already, Penny. Would it be helpful for you to have
2 us include it on page 7 in addition to it?

3 NAKASHIMA: Where on page 8 do you have that?

4 BURIL: Mark?

5 NAKASHIMA: Can you point that out to me?

6 CUTLER: Under Analytical Methods, the second
7 paragraph, that little three-line paragraph.

8 NAKASHIMA: I'm sorry. Under what heading is
9 that?

10 CUTLER: Under Analytical Methods.

11 I may have the wrong page. I'm going off
12 of a later version.

13 NAKASHIMA: Okay. That's on page 7.

14 CUTLER: Okay.

15 NAKASHIMA: Okay. That's fine.

16 BURIL: So we have that one resolved. No
17 problem. Is that true, Penny?

18 NAKASHIMA: Yes.

19 BURIL: Okay. Thank you.

20 Going on to the second section, Addendum
21 to the Field Sampling and Analysis Plan for Operable
22 Unit 1, rationale for MW-23 under comment number 1.

23 I think the best thing that we can offer
24 you, Penny, at this point is to take this under
25 advisement. We don't see a major problem with this,

1 but we'd like to think a little bit about it and
2 come back to you with a response, either in changing
3 it or with some other response.

4 The second one under that same section,
5 groundwater samples and analysis, this is a major
6 departure from what we had agreed to previously. I
7 guess, Penny, I'd like to understand where your
8 comment is coming from, given that we had discussed
9 this at two previous RPM meetings and had agreed to
10 an analytical suite.

11 Penny?

12 NAKASHIMA: I'm sorry. I didn't know you were
13 finished.

14 BURIL: I'm sorry. I should have said
15 something.

16 NAKASHIMA: Yes. We said that we -- I thought
17 we had agreed that for the quarterly -- for the one
18 year of quarterly monitoring that everything would
19 be analyzed for. And in the OU-1 addendum, I didn't
20 see the SVOCs or the Title 22 metals.

21 BURIL: I don't recall that, Penny.

22 I guess I would refer back to the January
23 meeting minutes. But in this forum I think it would
24 probably be better to do that in a face-to-face
25 meeting, perhaps.

1 Suffice to say that we had thought that
2 the analytical suite was going to be reduced during
3 the monitoring program at the outset based on the
4 data that we had already obtained through the RI
5 work. We had seen essentially a zero metal concern,
6 with the exception of chromium, and had seen
7 essentially no concern with SVOCs. So we were under
8 the impression that that was the agreed upon
9 analytical suite and I believe that's how it was
10 presented in our initial discussion. I wasn't
11 aware, based on my understanding, that there were
12 any changes to that.

13 NAKASHIMA: Chuck, this is Penny.

14 I recall in the meeting that I guess we
15 had talked about this and Peter had requested that
16 we get quarterly monitoring for one year,
17 everything, before we start eliminating.

18 BURIL: That was before we started eliminating
19 screens, was what we were indicating.

20 NAKASHIMA: And then also, there are some
21 results which do show some PAHs and benzopyrene in
22 Monitoring Well 12 on the second screen in two of
23 the sampling rounds. So maybe if I can make the
24 proposal that in the area around or downgradient of
25 and also in MW-(undecipherable) in that area

1 (undecipherable) analyze constituents since they
2 were --

3 CUTLER: That was only detected in the first
4 round and not in the second round.

5 NIOU: This is Stephen Niou.

6 My feeling is since JPL hasn't done a
7 thorough job of screening all the detected chemicals
8 and put a report and identify those SVOCs, maybe we
9 should do some formal or semiformal stats to decide
10 which chemicals should be in the list as COCs to be
11 included in groundwater sampling. Otherwise, when
12 we get to the stage of doing risk assessment, we may
13 not have enough data to support our decision of the
14 combination of COCs.

15 BURIL: This is Chuck.

16 I can see that this is going to be a
17 fairly contentious issue insomuch as we thought we
18 had agreement and it sounds now that we're falling
19 out of agreement. I think that this is probably one
20 that is better discussed in a forum other than a
21 telecon.

22 I'm going to ask that we table the
23 discussion on this for the time being for a meeting
24 that will hopefully occur in a very short period of
25 time in a face-to-face forum.

1 Moving on, then, to the next section, the
2 addendum for field sampling and analysis plan for
3 Operable Unit 2.

4 Under number 1, Penny, that's not a
5 problem. We can include a statement regarding the
6 constraints that we had to identify that. We should
7 be able to accommodate you with no problem.

8 Under number 2, the analysis of tributyl
9 tin. I'm somewhat curious as to why this is a
10 concern of yours, given the fact that we have no
11 indication that tributyl tin was ever used here.

12 NAKASHIMA: I mentioned in the last telecon that
13 there may be a concern for the tributyl tin because
14 it's something that was used in the cooling towers.

15 BURIL: Do you know that was used at JPL?

16 NAKASHIMA: No. No. I don't know that it was
17 specifically used at JPL, but it's typically used on
18 cooling towers. Since there is no documentation
19 from JPL in your records that it wasn't ever used,
20 this is something that is a very -- it's apparently
21 very toxic for not only human health but also for
22 the eco assessment.

23 BURIL: This is Chuck again. If I can step in
24 here.

25 This is something of a new issue,

1 especially since it just came up at the last
2 telecon, which was just a few weeks ago.

3 NAKASHIMA: Right.

4 BURIL: This is something, again, that I'm
5 concerned with insomuch as we appear to be doing
6 things simply because there's an outside chance of
7 being a problem as opposed to a known and certain
8 problem. I think, again, we're in a position of
9 saying that this is one where a face-to-face forum
10 is going to be necessary to resolve the issue before
11 we can assume that it is closed. So let us table
12 this one as well at this time and see what else we
13 can come through on.

14 LOWE: This is Debbie.

15 Can I ask that Penny try to find some more
16 information for the group on the fate and transport
17 of this contaminant before the next meeting?

18 NAKASHIMA: Oh, sure. Okay.

19 MELCHIOR: This is Dan.

20 I'm very much more concerned about finding
21 specific examples where Penny can cite that tributyl
22 tin was ever used at other installations for water
23 cooling towers. My indications from folks in the
24 Army that I've got here on staff that have worked in
25 industrial hygiene for 40 years, none of them can

1 recall ever using tributyl tin in water cooling
2 towers.

3 BURIL: This is Chuck.

4 My own experience in the electric utility
5 industry and petroleum industry also indicates that
6 tributyl tin was not the material of choice.
7 Typically the types of things that were used were
8 chromium compounds and our old friend hexavalent
9 chromium appeared to be the one of choice simply
10 because it was so effective in knocking down the bio
11 contamination.

12 I would appreciate very much also, Penny,
13 seeing some additional information on this. I
14 believe that JPL, while we can't produce records
15 that say distinctly we did not use it, I feel very
16 confident that we can show that we did not use
17 anything other than chrome, based on our own
18 records. We have no records that will show us that
19 over the course of time we did not use a given
20 substance. I think that assuming guilt rather than
21 assuming innocence is something that JPL is going to
22 have a problem with.

23 NAKASHIMA: The tributyl tin is something that
24 we've been finding in sites that have
25 (undecipherable). It's not something that I just

1 made up. This is something that we've been finding
2 in California, and that's the reason why I brought
3 it up. And also, Barbara brought it up because of
4 the toxicity, not only to the eco but to human
5 health. It's not something that gets analyzed for
6 from the water companies either. So that's one of
7 the reasons why I raised the issue or raised the
8 concern about the tributyl tin. If it's just for
9 the year of quarterly sampling, we can see, well, do
10 we have it, do we not have it, and then eliminate it
11 as a concern like with the other VOCs.

12 MELCHIOR: This is Dan Melchior.

13 We've done a little homework to assess
14 what the cost impacts are for making those analyses,
15 and we're looking on the order of basically \$1,000
16 per sample. So this would not be a very simple
17 thing to accomplish. It would be very costly.

18 BURIL: This is Chuck, to break in quickly.

19 I think this is one, again, that we are
20 not going to reach resolution on. Suffice to say
21 that the cost and schedule implications are there on
22 this particular issue. I'd like to address that
23 once we get through the remainder of these a little
24 bit. But what I would like to do is to table this
25 one as well for the face-to-face forum, which I hope

1 we can set in the very near future, and move on to
2 hear a little bit more about some of these others as
3 well.

4 We're up to number 4 under that same
5 section. I guess, Penny, what concerns me here is
6 aside from the tributyl tin is you call out Title 22
7 metals. Before hearing your explanation of where
8 you're at, I just wanted to refresh your memory in
9 making a reference to the January 18th RPM meeting
10 minutes. On page 84, line number 15 we called out
11 very specifically that we were going to do VOAs,
12 semi VOAs, chrome and hex chrome, and it appeared
13 that everyone had agreed to that analytical regime.

14 So now I'm very curious as to why you've
15 added on these other constituents.

16 NAKASHIMA: Can I get back to you on that? I'm
17 in the process of moving and everything is boxed up.
18 Can I get back to you on that one?

19 BURIL: That's fair, sure. No problem.

20 NAKASHIMA: Dig out my data.

21 BURIL: I think what would be nice on that one
22 is if you could come back to us at our face-to-face
23 forum and provide to us your thoughts on that, it
24 would be most beneficial.

25 NAKASHIMA: Okay.

1 RANDOLPH: Chuck, this is B.G.

2 BURIL: Yes, B.G.

3 RANDOLPH: To move back to number 3.

4 BURIL: All right. You want to raise the point
5 that this is a bore hole and not a trench location,
6 B.G.? Is that what you're concerned with?

7 Hello, B.G.

8 RANDOLPH: I'm here. I said "correct."

9 BURIL: I'm sorry. We fell over each other.

10 That's just a point, Penny, that I'll
11 raise as maybe a point of clarification for you. I
12 don't know if it will impact your comment or not.
13 But the trenching at DP-2 is actually a bore hole.
14 It is not a trench.

15 Like I say, I don't know if that makes a
16 difference to you or not, but I would encourage you
17 to look at that again in light of the fact that it
18 is a bore hole and see whether that addresses your
19 concern. Not with the idea of doing it in this
20 forum again. I think, again, we're still concerned
21 about the idea of the change in scope and so forth.
22 So having that information available for us at our
23 face-to-face I think would be the best way to
24 approach that.

25 NAKASHIMA: Okay.

1 BURIL: I guess we're up to number 5, then, on
2 drilling method.

3 We've stated a little bit about sonic
4 drilling techniques, Penny, in the addenda. Can you
5 give us any indication as to what other information
6 or greater degree of detail you'd be looking for?

7 NAKASHIMA: Right. Actually, what I was looking
8 for there is just the success or the use of this
9 method at other sites where soil vapor monitoring
10 points are installed. Have there been any tests
11 done comparing this method versus augering or some
12 other type of method? If so, if there's any impact
13 or any difference in the amount of vapor that you
14 can extract from using this sonic drilling method.
15 Just some data showing the use of it, that there's
16 no impact or minimal impact or there is impact;
17 something. There must be some type of study or
18 something that was done on that.

19 BURIL: This is Chuck.

20 I don't know that anything like that
21 specifically exists. I do know that Foster Wheeler
22 contacted Debbie's suggested contacts. Where was
23 that? Mather Air Force Base, Debbie?

24 RANDOLPH: Chuck, this is B.G.

25 BURIL: Yes, B.G.

1 RANDOLPH: We talked with Bill Hughes of EPA
2 there, and also to another gentleman who was
3 actually the geologist for IT Corporation who sat on
4 the rig. They were both very enthusiastic about
5 using the sonic drilling method for installing soil
6 vapor probes and wells, and also for the use of
7 obtaining relatively undisturbed soil samples,
8 comparing the vapor results or readings and actual
9 laboratory analyses for VOCs on those undisturbed
10 samples versus the core, which they obtained from
11 the core barrel on the sonic rig.

12 There is not enough difference to tell
13 which method was the most accurate. They compare
14 very favorably and appear to have no real impact on
15 any of the soil vapor studies that they did as well.

16 BURIL: But in terms of quantitative data, which
17 it appears that Penny is requesting, is there
18 anything that was available through those folks?

19 RANDOLPH: No.

20 BURIL: Okay. Penny, it may be that we're in a
21 position of offering you that anecdotal information
22 only. If this is insufficient to allow us to
23 utilize the method, I think that your thoughts and
24 rationale for that decision would be very beneficial
25 for us at our face-to-face meeting. It is a new

1 method. It is one which I do not believe has a
2 great deal of experience, and therefore the studies
3 that you're talking about may not exist.

4 So how you would respond to that, I would
5 encourage you to give that consideration between now
6 and our face-to-face.

7 Last thing. Number 6. This goes back to
8 one of the original comments in the DTSC memo I
9 believe of last November. It was indicated, I
10 thought fairly clearly, that NASA was not prepared
11 to do this in consideration of all the problems.

12 Now, the thing I want to clarify, though,
13 is that, Penny, we're talking about soil trenches,
14 soil borings? Or which one of these are we talking
15 about here? It's under Section 6.2.2.2, which leads
16 me to believe that you're concerned about soil
17 borings.

18 NAKASHIMA: Right.

19 BURIL: So it is soil borings that you're most
20 concerned with.

21 Recognizing the constraints of the type of
22 equipment that we would have to use if we did not
23 use sonic drilling, there would be no way for us to
24 sample finer grained lithologies or horizons
25 whatsoever, as the percussion rigs and air rotary

1 and so forth simply do not allow us to make the fine
2 distinctions you would be looking for.

3 NAKASHIMA: But you will do that in your
4 trenches, then. I think that's something you had in
5 your January 11th letter, that you would.

6 BURIL: No. In fact, I believe we said we would
7 not.

8 RANDOLPH: In the trenches we said we would.

9 BURIL: Oh, we did?

10 NAKASHIMA: Right. In the trenches you said you
11 would.

12 BURIL: But we would have you present, is how I
13 believe we couched that, is that we would be
14 prepared to do so, but you would be present to
15 supervise what it was we did do. But the original
16 plan, from my best recollection, is that unless
17 there was reasonably significant visual evidence
18 that there was a need to sample, we would not go
19 beyond what was identified as the minimum scope of
20 work.

21 Is that correct, B.G.?

22 RANDOLPH: That's correct.

23 BURIL: Again, this was agreed to, based on my
24 recollection and understanding of the meeting
25 minutes of January 18th. So again, I think we're

1 again in a position of needing to better understand
2 this, particularly in light of the fact that it
3 appeared to have been resolved some six months ago.
4 Again, I believe the forum of a telephone conference
5 is probably not the best to do so.

6 So I would ask, Penny, that we hear from
7 you at the face-to-face on all of these things that
8 we have tabled from the standpoint of being in the
9 incorrect forum to really resolve them.

10 I will make a fairly broad, sweeping
11 statement now in terms of the project as a whole,
12 and that is that the changes that are being
13 identified here are not inconsequential. They
14 drastically have impact on the scope, the dollars,
15 and on schedule. These are not things that we can
16 do very readily within the confines of the scope of
17 work and the contractual requirements that we had
18 already laid down.

19 We need to resolve these rapidly. As it
20 stands now, with the analytical suites in question,
21 the number of borings in question, the number of
22 samples apparently in question, the project is going
23 to take a big stop if we cannot resolve this in a
24 very rapid fashion.

25 So I would like to find out, without even

1 bothering to go to the agenda number 2. The
2 schedule itself, while you've received -- hopefully
3 you've all received a revised schedule. That
4 schedule is dependent upon acceptance of the scope
5 of work that we discussed at the last two RPM
6 meetings. If we are to change that significantly,
7 then that schedule is going to have to be changed as
8 well.

9 There is a concern, albeit I don't know to
10 what degree, but there is a concern regarding
11 funding. If we do have a significant increase in
12 the amount of work that's going to be done, I may
13 have difficulty in obtaining the funding to do it in
14 this fiscal year or next, as I have already
15 submitted my budgets for the next six years.

16 BISHOP: Chuck, this is Jon Bishop.

17 I understand your point, but you can't
18 tell me that the next six years' budget is fixed.

19 BURIL: No, Jon. What I'm saying is this year's
20 is to a large degree. I have some wiggle room. But
21 depending upon what we're talking about here, I
22 don't know if I have enough. The next six years is
23 only indicated to you to try and emphasize the fact
24 that the way that NASA works is we have to plan five
25 years in advance. I have already done that based on

1 this scope of work and what we anticipate the
2 schedule to be in the coming years.

3 The scope of work can change during that
4 course of time, but the one scope of work that is in
5 very near time, the one that we have been
6 discussing, is one which we have fixed a budget on,
7 and it will be an effort to try and increase that
8 budget significantly based on NASA's concerns with
9 the federal government budgets being reduced, and so
10 forth.

11 It's only a question of scale. Like I
12 say, I have some ability to wiggle around. But if
13 we are talking about major changes, it will be a
14 concern.

15 Again, I don't believe that we are in a
16 position at this point or in this forum to discuss
17 number 2 on the agenda, which should have been the
18 schedule.

19 The status of the project, I can tell you
20 where we were up to this point, and that is that we
21 had the draft-final addenda ready to go out the door
22 to the agencies for review and final approval. We
23 have put that on hold now.

24 It's unfortunate that neither JPL, NASA
25 nor the agencies were able to contact each other to

1 let each other know that there was potential concern
2 about additional comments. I think maybe that's a
3 lesson learned for all of us, is to communicate a
4 little more clearly when things like this appear to
5 be happening.

6 But as it stands right now, our
7 contractual requirements are ready to be set up and
8 we are in a position of having our Foster Wheeler
9 contract extended and we were definitizing it on the
10 basis of the scope that we have now. I can continue
11 that as a minimal scope and we'll see what kind of
12 things we come up with that may increase that and
13 what problems I run into with procurement on that
14 basis.

15 Like I say, we've basically completed a
16 large part of our contractual requirements with
17 Foster Wheeler. While we're a little behind on the
18 subcontractor contractual requirements, we have
19 nonetheless begun those as well. So depending upon
20 the nature and magnitude of the scope change that we
21 may be facing, a lot of this work may have to be
22 modified or even redone.

23 So I am just simply giving you the heads
24 up that this is a fairly significant concern for us.

25 That having been said, I would very much

1 appreciate if the agencies and Foster Wheeler would
2 all have the opportunity to -- maybe if we can look
3 at your schedules now in this teleconference and
4 establish a date for a face-to-face meeting.

5 LOWE: Chuck, before we do that, I'd like to ask
6 if Jon is going to be having any additional comments
7 on this addenda.

8 BISHOP: Excuse me. I had pushed my mute
9 button. I was talking away and you guys, of course,
10 were not hearing me.

11 No. I've reviewed it and I don't have any
12 additional comments.

13 BURIL: That's great, Jon. Thank you.

14 Okay. Then that being said, I'd like to
15 go ahead and establish the time and date and
16 location of a face-to-face meeting so that we can
17 resolve these issues as rapidly as we possibly can.

18 Next week, in the first part of the week I
19 myself am not available until Thursday or Friday of
20 next week. And then beyond that, I'm reasonably
21 open. I'll throw that on the table as a starting
22 point if we can identify a given date.

23 LOWE: This is Debbie.

24 I would like the opportunity for the
25 agencies to have a pre meeting. So my question is,

1 Penny and Jon, are you available on Thursday for pre
2 meeting, and then I would propose Friday for the
3 actual meeting with JPL.

4 NAKASHIMA: Is this the 18th and the 19th?

5 BURIL: The 18th and the 19th. That's correct,
6 Penny.

7 BISHOP: Jon Bishop.

8 Yes. I'm available both the 18th and the
9 19th.

10 NAKASHIMA: I'm available.

11 NIOU: This is Stephen Niou.

12 I'm available both days.

13 BURIL: And I am available as well, and my
14 understanding from Foster Wheeler is that you folks
15 are available as well?

16 MELCHIOR: I cannot make it the 18th.

17 BURIL: The 18th is okay, Dan. How about the
18 19th?

19 MELCHIOR: I would have to leave. I've got a
20 wedding to be back to on Saturday. I would have to
21 leave probably around noon.

22 BURIL: Well, we would like to have you there,
23 but in deference to the agencies, I think if you can
24 participate via telecon or some other fashion, that
25 would be suitable for me.

1 MELCHIOR: Oh, okay. Well, then, I can be there
2 on the 19th, then.

3 BURIL: Mark and B.G., I assume you're clear.

4 RANDOLPH: Yes.

5 CUTLER: Yes.

6 BURIL: All right. Debbie, I guess your
7 suggestion of a pre meeting on the 18th amongst the
8 agencies is good, and then the following day a
9 meeting on the 19th with all parties involved.

10 LOWE: I thought I would throw this out as a
11 concept, to meet on the 19th on more neutral
12 territory.

13 BURIL: That's fair.

14 LOWE: I was going to offer Jon Bishop's office.

15 BISHOP: Yes. That's available on the 19th.

16 BURIL: Okay. I'm just trying to think if we're
17 going to need anything from JPL. I have no problem
18 with that per se. That's fine.

19 LOWE: Give us some relief on the parking
20 problem.

21 BURIL: Okay. Why don't we plan that, then.

22 Jon, I'm going to ask that we start the
23 meeting a little later. I have an 8:30 meeting that
24 I'd like to try and attend. If we could start this
25 at 10:00 o'clock, it would be very helpful to me.

1 NAKASHIMA: What time was that?

2 BURIL: 10.

3 LOWE: I think Chuck said 10:00 o'clock.

4 NAKASHIMA: 10? Oh.

5 BISHOP: That's fine with me, Chuck.

6 NIOU: Is the meeting at the Water Board?

7 BISHOP: Yes.

8 BURIL: Yes. That's correct.

9 BISHOP: Here in Monterey Park.

10 BURIL: Okay, then. I think that's great.

11 We'll go ahead and plan for that. I encourage
12 everyone to please try and keep your schedules open
13 for those days, as I believe this is critical that
14 we resolve these things rapidly.

15 LOWE: The other concepts that I wanted to throw
16 out on the table is that, recognizing that these are
17 potentially very contentious issues, would DTSC and
18 NASA be interested in involving one level of
19 management higher in this meeting? I don't think
20 that I have the resources to bring someone down with
21 me at this short notice, but knowing that your
22 people wouldn't have to travel and that most of this
23 contention is between those two agencies, it might
24 facilitate a more quicker resolution to these
25 issues.

1 BURIL: That's a reasonable thought, Debbie. I
2 cannot speak for Peter or his management.
3 Unfortunately, he has been delayed inadvertently.
4 There's no way I can answer that without first
5 talking with him and his executive management.

6 LOWE: This is Debbie again.

7 We have a conference call scheduled for
8 Friday at 11. I'm not sure if that's still on. But
9 one potential course of action is to have you talk
10 to Peter about that possibility and his management's
11 availability, I need to do the same, and to make
12 that decision on Friday.

13 BURIL: That's a very good suggestion.

14 As far as I know, the issues that we've
15 discussed here aside, the discussion of the risk
16 assessment flow chart is still on for 11:00 o'clock
17 on Friday. I believe we should plan on doing that
18 unless there is a change there that heretofore we
19 are unaware of.

20 NAKASHIMA: I wasn't aware that it was at 11:00.
21 I thought it was at 1:00, from the last message I
22 received from Laurann. I have to check with Barbara
23 on the 11:00 o'clock.

24 BURIL: All right. That's fine, Penny. Please
25 let us know. We are very anxious to try and get

1 that one resolved, as it's been on the table for
2 some time.

3 LOWE: This is Debbie again.

4 From talking to Penny earlier today, it
5 seems that some of her comments on the addenda are
6 kind of intertwined with the risk assessment. I'm
7 speaking specifically about the comments regarding
8 additional constituents in the groundwater and the
9 soil. It may be worth trying to deal with those
10 issues with the risk assessors on line.

11 BURIL: Let me offer an alternative thought
12 here, Debbie, and that is given the risk assessors'
13 need to at least look at the flow chart, perhaps the
14 changes that we're discussing may or may not become
15 part of the concern for the risk assessment,
16 depending upon how they're ultimately resolved.

17 If we believe that they will become a part
18 of it based on meetings that we have in the future,
19 I would suggest that we resolve it then. But I
20 don't believe that we're going to be in a position
21 of saying concretely one way or another that they
22 are going to be part of the risk assessment flow
23 chart discussion itself. I think the flow chart is
24 really simply an overall approach and doesn't
25 discuss the individual constituents and the need or

1 the lack of need for data.

2 LOWE: Chuck, this is Debbie again.

3 What I was more saying is that my
4 understanding from talking to Penny is that it's her
5 risk assessor that's driving some of these comments.

6 BURIL: Oh, I misunderstood.

7 LOWE: It may be worth bringing up these
8 comments during the call and having direct
9 involvement from the risk assessors on whether --
10 not analyzing for SVOCs in all the wells somehow
11 creates a data gap in the risk assessment that us
12 engineers and geologists aren't aware of.

13 Maybe, Penny, you can think about that a
14 little bit more and identify for us on Friday which
15 of the comments you think would be good to talk
16 about prior to the next week's meeting.

17 BURIL: So if I understand you correctly, we'd
18 like on Friday to get a little more information from
19 the risk assessors regarding these comments? Is
20 that what your goal is, Debbie?

21 NAKASHIMA: We can bring this issue up on Friday
22 and discuss it amongst the risk assessors, about
23 collecting this data. It won't pose a problem once
24 we look at the risk assessment. Now, we're going to
25 look at the data and say, well, gee, we didn't

1 analyze for these constituents here and we only have
2 two rounds of sampling data and it's not telling us
3 anything. Then what's going to happen? You're
4 going to have to go (undecipherable) monitoring gap
5 and sample for these things then (undecipherable)
6 analyze.

7 It may not be in this year's
8 (undecipherable), but maybe it could be included in
9 next year's budget.

10 BURIL: Well, yes. You're raising issues there
11 that if we don't do it this year and do it next, you
12 delay the completion of the risk assessment, and
13 ultimately the ROD itself is pushed out by whatever
14 length of time that we wait to incorporate those
15 data.

16 BISHOP: Right. But if the risk assessors say
17 (undecipherable) without it, that's going to have to
18 be taken into consideration, Chuck.

19 BURIL: No, I understand, Jon. I'm not
20 disagreeing we should have the risk assessors there.
21 It's simply a concern about the schedule. I'm very
22 schedule driven in this particular situation, and I
23 just want to be sure that people recognize that
24 moving things around that would ultimately impact
25 portions of the data and portions of the reports

1 that are generated is going to have impacts down the
2 road in terms of the project as a whole.

3 Well, it sounds to me like we've got our
4 meeting dates set, and I just understood that Peter
5 is going to try to tap in here in just a moment. He
6 may come to a blank line. I don't know.

7 Is there anything more that anyone would
8 like to bring up at this point prior to our meeting
9 on the 19th or to our telecon on the 12th?

10 LOWE: Was there going to be an agenda for the
11 12th, or are we just talking about the material that
12 was faxed?

13 BURIL: The material that's faxed was my only
14 plan, Debbie, just principally to be sure that the
15 risk assessment experts had opportunity to see the
16 approach which we're planning to use and had
17 opportunity at the outset to give comment to us so
18 that we can know that this is going to be an
19 accepted approach before we even get to the point of
20 having the data to plug in.

21 LOWE: Okay. I wanted to say to Penny that I
22 think it would be good if you and Barbara and Dan
23 and I talked prior to 11:00 o'clock.

24 NAKASHIMA: Right.

25 LOWE: So we'll try and call each other that

1 morning.

2 NAKASHIMA: You want to wait until that morning.

3 LOWE: I am out of the office tomorrow and
4 unavailable, so it's going to have to do.

5 BURIL: That's a good thought, Debbie. Thank
6 you for that.

7 I guess, then, we are adjourned until we
8 reconvene by telecon at 11:00 o'clock on Friday for
9 the risk assessment flow chart.

10 Jon, I assume that you will not attend
11 that one?

12 LOWE: I'm sorry. Who are you asking the
13 question to, Chuck?

14 BURIL: Was Jon planning on attending the one on
15 Friday? Jon, are you there?

16 BISHOP: I'm here. I didn't hear my name at
17 all, Chuck.

18 BURIL: Oh, you didn't. I'm sorry. Were you
19 planning to attend the Friday telecon?

20 BISHOP: No, I wasn't.

21 BURIL: Fine. We won't wait for you if you
22 don't show. Then I guess we'll all meet together at
23 Jon's location at 10:00 o'clock on July 19th.

24 BISHOP: Correct.

25 NAKASHIMA: I have one question on the Friday,

1 the 12th telecon. Is there a number that we call in
2 to?

3 BURIL: I'm going to change that because
4 currently it's the same number. I trust it about as
5 far as I can throw this building.

6 NAKASHIMA: So you'll contact us and let us
7 know.

8 BURIL: I will have Laurann get hold of each of
9 you hopefully tomorrow with a different number, if
10 at all possible. I apologize for the problems that
11 we had initially here, folks. I don't know what
12 happened, but hopefully we can avoid it by getting a
13 different number.

14 With that, I'll say thanks very much, and
15 we'll talk to everyone on the 12th and 19th.

16 BISHOP: Okay. Bye-bye.

17 NAKASHIMA: Bye.

18 LOWE: Bye.

19 NIOU: Debbie, I'll call you.

20 (The proceedings adjourned at 2:34 P.M.)
21
22
23
24
25